Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/635,899	PETRIE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Darren W. Ark	3643	
All Participants:	Status of Application: Response to Non-Final		
(1) <u>Darren W. Ark</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Jason W. Bryan</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 20 September 2010	Time: <u>3:15pm EST</u>		
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: Rejections of the Non-Final Action mailed on 05/18/2010			
Claims discussed: 9, 13, 16, 18, and 21			
Prior art documents discussed:  Prior art of record			
Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summan</li> </ul>	e examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the interview, since	ne substance
/Darren W. Ark/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3643	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if a	appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner proposed amendments to the claims to ovecome claim objections and 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph rejections. Examiner stated that in particular, at claim 9, lines 27-28, Examiner proposed to amend the terms "front side portion" and "rear portion" to be replaced with --front side portions-- and --rear side portions-- since it is not a single portion of each which contacts the rod as such and instead it is the front side portions and rear side portions of the lid and base portions which contact the fishing rod and different portion of the fishing rod respectively. Examiner also stated that at claim 9, lines 37-38, Examiner proposed to replace "an" before "interior" with --the-- since the term "an interior of said carrier box" was previously recited at claim 9, lines 29-30. Examiner proposed the same amendment at claim 21, lines 35-36. Examiner proposed amending claim 13 to properly correlate the structure of the at least two mating portions previously recited in claim 9. Examiner proposed deleting the second occurrence of the paragraph that begins "a pliable buffer arranged..." toward the end of claim 21 since it is redundant with respect to the paragraph which precedes it. Applicant agrees with the proposed amendment. Please see the Examiner's Amendment for details.